

TO-MORROW

The WORLD ALMANAC will be out To-Morrow.

LAST EDITION.

GOOD FOR IRELAND.

The General Irish Verdict on the New Home Rule Bill.

Official Nationalist Indorsement of the Measure Issued.

Views of William O'Brien, John Dillon, John Burns and Others.

LONDON, Feb. 14.—William O'Brien, M.P. for Cork city, sent this morning an interview regarding the Home Rule bill: "It seems to me that the main principles of the bill provide for a better settlement of the Home Rule question than the bill of 1886. We are able to heartily recommend Irish acceptance of the measure. It gives substantial control over our domestic affairs. We should not be justified in resenting the provisions giving the minority adequate representation, and providing for a veto by the Crown and the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament.

"The second chamber of the Irish Legislature will doubtless be a considerable drag, and the franchise of twenty pounds will probably insure a majority of the members of the council for the Tory land-owners, who are certain to combine against any extravagant proposals on the part of the popular chamber. This, however, is not likely to be a stumbling-block, as the Nationalists do not contemplate a revolutionary programme.

"The police arrangements," added Mr. O'Brien, "are practically those agreed upon with Mr. Parnell at Boulogne. The bulk of the present force will doubtless be re-engaged under Irish authority. The checks upon the appointment of judges are reasonable, but possibly useful. There are now too many judges in Ireland, but the chances are that the more rabid of these will retire on pensions.

"It is a sacrifice to demand that Irishmen should be debarred from touching the land question for three years. We recognize that the compromise is reasonable, but must press for power to check the present Land Commission, in the mean time, from saddling leaseholders with rackrents. Irishmen will probably assent to a reduction of the membership at Westminster.

John Burns, the latter member from Battersea, said he was greatly pleased with the bill, although from a democratic point of view it was not an ideal measure. He objected to the veto power reserved to the Crown, to the second chamber, and especially to the election of that chamber by limited franchise. Mr. Burns added that, notwithstanding these objections, he would certainly support the measure.

Mr. Gladstone spent an excellent night and arose at his usual hour in a hearty condition, afterwards proceeding to the House of Commons to listen to the speech of Mr. Parnell, who, in all the main principles, and in the political machinery it is provided much better than the bill of 1886.

The bill offers Ireland a Legislature, a free deal in all Irish affairs, and an executive government responsible to that Legislature. In all the main principles, and in the political machinery it is provided much better than the bill of 1886.

The Irish Parliamentary party, at a meeting specially summoned after the delivery of Mr. Gladstone's speech, unanimously accepted the new Home Rule constitution as a satisfactory scheme of Irish National self-government, subject to endowments in Committee to improve the proposed financial arrangements and to have the time shortened for the land question.

We are authorized by the party to transmit this resolution to the friends and supporters of Irish liberty in the United States and Canada.

JOHN DILLON, (Signed.)

JOHN DILLON, in an interview, said that the main fact was admitted on all sides that the bill was a great advance on the Home Rule bill of 1886. "Hence," he added, "the Irish feel that, although they cannot approve the present financial proposals, and the provision regarding the land question, they are bound to recognize in the heartiest manner the noble courage and fidelity of Mr. Gladstone in offering this constitution to their country.

"The main improvement in the bill is: First, the disappearance of the Executive Council and consequent perfect financial freedom for the Irish Government, which will be able to collect and control its own revenues.

Second, the constitution of the second chamber, which makes the Legislature a thoroughly workable and democratic body.

Third, the veto power, which is provided for in a better manner than in the bill of 1886.

Fourth, Irish control of the police and of the land question after a limited period.

"I regard to the retention of Irish members at Westminster, it may be mentioned that this was accepted by Mr. Parnell years ago. It is a subject the Irish have always agreed upon as non-essential, provided the Legislature of Ireland has full power over Irish affairs. I see no objection to a reduction of the number of Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament, and I accept the religious restrictions heartily.

"I believe the bill will pass the House of Commons. The Tories are, of course, as utterly opposed to it as they were to the bill of 1886, but I consider that Irishmen will refuse to accept it will prove themselves unworthy of the confidence of their country."

TRYING TO SAVE HIM.

Mr. Hayes, Sick Nigh to Death, Testifies for Her Husband.

Reclines in a Steamer Chair, with Her Doctor at Her Side.

Pitiable Scene in the Colonel's Second Trial for Perjury.

It is evident that there are "wheels within wheels" in the second trial of Col. William B. Hayes, now going on in Part II. of General Sessions, that is, in the efforts of counsel on either side to prove or disprove the charge of perjury against the formerly exalted, it is quite apparent that some of the witnesses have committed perjury.

The perjury has been committed in patent, because of the positively contradictory testimony given by the witnesses on either side, but as to who the perjurers are must be determined by the jury.

The witnesses called by the defense so far have nearly all denied that Col. Hayes was in New York during the months of October, November and December, 1879, when it is alleged that he made the \$200 note to Miss Keating.

Witnesses for the prosecution have asserted with equal positiveness that Col. Hayes was in New York during the time in question, but was also confined in his East Eighty-ninth street flat with a jailer for perjury.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

RESTAURANT FORCED.

Manhattan Life's Men Enter Gossford's Place at Night.

It Is About Dismantled Before They Are Discovered.

Foreman Cleary Held for Examination for Burglary.

Michael Cleary, a foreman laborer, of 233 Mulberry street, was arraigned in the Tombs Court this morning upon a charge of burglary and was held in \$1,000 bail for examination on Feb. 16.

Cleary's offense was that of entering Charles A. Gossford's restaurant, in the basement of 19 New street, where the Manhattan Life Insurance Company is putting up a large office building.

When the Company began to tear down the old building it bought all of the leases but that of Gossford, which expires in May. He secured an injunction against the company, but this was dissolved upon the presentation of a bond for \$10,000 to indemnify him for damage.

Although the ruins were piled high about him, Gossford employed a watchman, and the police kept him in New York to prevent the company from gaining possession in his absence.

The other day some one broke a hole in the ceiling and drenched a customer with water as he was eating in the restaurant and under orders he says, from John Stokes, a brother of Joseph Stokes, of the Manhattan Life Insurance Company, had broken into everything the restaurant contained.

Watchman Stephen Curley was left in charge of the place and Leary was locked up. He told Justice Ryan that he found the door of the place open when he got there. No one connected with the Company was present, and his friend, Daniel Shue, went on his bond.

Gossford is now in possession of the field of battle, while a suit for dispossession is pending before Civil Justice Clancy, who is expected to hand down a decision this afternoon.

On cross-examination Mr. Cleary admitted that he and a man named Land had received \$500 from the Company to enter and testify for him, with the understanding that they were to receive \$500 more upon their arrival in New York.

Mr. Cleary admitted that he and Land would leave them \$500 apiece to spend as they see fit during their stay in the metropolis. Mr. Cleary also admitted that he had acted as counsel for Hayes in the case.

On re-direct examination Mr. Cleary said he was to receive \$500 of the \$500, but it was a poor compensation for the loss of his time and business in coming North.

George W. Land, a real estate broker of Barlow, was also called to testify for Col. Hayes for \$250.

Abraham Lyons, manufacturing jeweler and watchmaker, of 100 West 14th street, was also called to testify for Col. Hayes.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

Mrs. Hayes, the Colonel's wife, who has been ill since the first trial, was this morning carried into court, wrapped in blankets, by Lawyer Haile and another man, just before the jury retired, from their room to the room to wait her turn as a witness.

Witnesses for the defense declare that it was Hayes's brother, Joseph J., and not the Colonel, who had the sore throat. Lawyer Robert J. Haile has explained his connection with the case, as one of Hayes's legal advisers.

GARDNER SENTENCED.

Two Years in Sing Sing for the Parkhurst Agent.

The Society's Counsel Secures Him a Stay Pending Appeal.

Lawyers Jerome and Goff Before the Court for Contempt.

Charles E. Gardner, the former chief detective of Dr. Parkhurst's Society for the Prevention of Crime, convicted of attempting to extort \$150 from Lillie Chilton, the keeper of a disorderly-house in West Fifty-third street, was sentenced this morning by Recorder Smyth, in Part II. of the court of General Sessions, to two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison.

Justice Andrews, of the Supreme Court, immediately after the sentence, granted a stay pending appeal upon the application of Frank Moss, the Parkhurst Society's counsel.

Mr. Moss said that the Recorder had admitted improper evidence and excluded relevant testimony. He laid particular stress upon the point that Gardner's counsel advised him not to stand up for identification the court officers pushed him out of his chair and held him up.

There was a big crowd in court when Gardner was called to the bar at 11.15 o'clock. He was pale and haggard. His sandy mustache drooped dejectedly over the corners of his mouth and the stubby growth of beard added to his generally fatigued expression.

Attorney Goff moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

The Recorder then reviewed the various parts of the testimony of witnesses which he said had proved contemptuous and insolent conduct towards the Court on the part of Attorneys Goff and Jerome.

After reading the specifications which included but one offense of contempt against Mr. Jerome, the others being all alleged against Mr. Goff, the Recorder said he would not proceed to punish the attorneys before proceeding further.

Lawyer Jerome arose visibly affected. With the tears welling into his eyes, and his voice quivering with emotion, he said that he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

"And for that I present my sincere apology to the Court," said Mr. Jerome. Here he was forced to pause in consequence of his emotion, and then continued:

"Our relations have been heretofore so pleasant, and your honor has been so kind that I have never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court."

Lawyer Goff then arose and said he would apologize for appearing to have been insolent, as he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

Mr. Goff then moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

WITH ST. VALENTINE'S COMPLIMENTS.

The Society's Counsel Secures Him a Stay Pending Appeal.

Lawyers Jerome and Goff Before the Court for Contempt.

Charles E. Gardner, the former chief detective of Dr. Parkhurst's Society for the Prevention of Crime, convicted of attempting to extort \$150 from Lillie Chilton, the keeper of a disorderly-house in West Fifty-third street, was sentenced this morning by Recorder Smyth, in Part II. of the court of General Sessions, to two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison.

Justice Andrews, of the Supreme Court, immediately after the sentence, granted a stay pending appeal upon the application of Frank Moss, the Parkhurst Society's counsel.

Mr. Moss said that the Recorder had admitted improper evidence and excluded relevant testimony. He laid particular stress upon the point that Gardner's counsel advised him not to stand up for identification the court officers pushed him out of his chair and held him up.

There was a big crowd in court when Gardner was called to the bar at 11.15 o'clock. He was pale and haggard. His sandy mustache drooped dejectedly over the corners of his mouth and the stubby growth of beard added to his generally fatigued expression.

Attorney Goff moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

The Recorder then reviewed the various parts of the testimony of witnesses which he said had proved contemptuous and insolent conduct towards the Court on the part of Attorneys Goff and Jerome.

After reading the specifications which included but one offense of contempt against Mr. Jerome, the others being all alleged against Mr. Goff, the Recorder said he would not proceed to punish the attorneys before proceeding further.

Lawyer Jerome arose visibly affected. With the tears welling into his eyes, and his voice quivering with emotion, he said that he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

"And for that I present my sincere apology to the Court," said Mr. Jerome. Here he was forced to pause in consequence of his emotion, and then continued:

"Our relations have been heretofore so pleasant, and your honor has been so kind that I have never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court."

Lawyer Goff then arose and said he would apologize for appearing to have been insolent, as he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

Mr. Goff then moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

THE CIRCUS IS COMING.

Aldermen Give Barnum & Bailey Permission to Parade - Other Business.

The Society's Counsel Secures Him a Stay Pending Appeal.

Lawyers Jerome and Goff Before the Court for Contempt.

Charles E. Gardner, the former chief detective of Dr. Parkhurst's Society for the Prevention of Crime, convicted of attempting to extort \$150 from Lillie Chilton, the keeper of a disorderly-house in West Fifty-third street, was sentenced this morning by Recorder Smyth, in Part II. of the court of General Sessions, to two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison.

Justice Andrews, of the Supreme Court, immediately after the sentence, granted a stay pending appeal upon the application of Frank Moss, the Parkhurst Society's counsel.

Mr. Moss said that the Recorder had admitted improper evidence and excluded relevant testimony. He laid particular stress upon the point that Gardner's counsel advised him not to stand up for identification the court officers pushed him out of his chair and held him up.

There was a big crowd in court when Gardner was called to the bar at 11.15 o'clock. He was pale and haggard. His sandy mustache drooped dejectedly over the corners of his mouth and the stubby growth of beard added to his generally fatigued expression.

Attorney Goff moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

The Recorder then reviewed the various parts of the testimony of witnesses which he said had proved contemptuous and insolent conduct towards the Court on the part of Attorneys Goff and Jerome.

After reading the specifications which included but one offense of contempt against Mr. Jerome, the others being all alleged against Mr. Goff, the Recorder said he would not proceed to punish the attorneys before proceeding further.

Lawyer Jerome arose visibly affected. With the tears welling into his eyes, and his voice quivering with emotion, he said that he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

"And for that I present my sincere apology to the Court," said Mr. Jerome. Here he was forced to pause in consequence of his emotion, and then continued:

"Our relations have been heretofore so pleasant, and your honor has been so kind that I have never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court."

Lawyer Goff then arose and said he would apologize for appearing to have been insolent, as he had never intended to stand up here to-day, and appear as having been in contempt of court.

Mr. Goff then moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

DR. HAYWARD'S SUDDEN DEATH.

Heart Disease Carries Off the Equitable Life Medical Examiner.

The Society's Counsel Secures Him a Stay Pending Appeal.

Lawyers Jerome and Goff Before the Court for Contempt.

Charles E. Gardner, the former chief detective of Dr. Parkhurst's Society for the Prevention of Crime, convicted of attempting to extort \$150 from Lillie Chilton, the keeper of a disorderly-house in West Fifty-third street, was sentenced this morning by Recorder Smyth, in Part II. of the court of General Sessions, to two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison.

Justice Andrews, of the Supreme Court, immediately after the sentence, granted a stay pending appeal upon the application of Frank Moss, the Parkhurst Society's counsel.

Mr. Moss said that the Recorder had admitted improper evidence and excluded relevant testimony. He laid particular stress upon the point that Gardner's counsel advised him not to stand up for identification the court officers pushed him out of his chair and held him up.

There was a big crowd in court when Gardner was called to the bar at 11.15 o'clock. He was pale and haggard. His sandy mustache drooped dejectedly over the corners of his mouth and the stubby growth of beard added to his generally fatigued expression.

Attorney Goff moved for a new trial and asked that the Court set aside the verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and because the jury disregarded the court's instructions.

Recorder Smyth denied the motions, and Lawyer Goff then moved for an arrest of judgment on the ground that there was a material variance in the offense as charged and the testimony given at the trial.

That was also denied, and Recorder Smyth then said Gardner had been convicted of a crime which he regarded as one of the most contemptible of offenses.

As the extreme penalty was two years at hard labor in Sing Sing prison he felt that the defendant deserved such a penalty, and he accordingly decreed such sentence.

After the sentence Recorder Smyth, addressing Attorneys Goff and Jerome, said that whatever action the Court might take would not injure the defendant, he would proceed to inflict punishment on the attorneys for what he considered contempt of court in their conduct of the Gardner case.

"I had made up my mind," continued the Recorder, "not to interfere with the progress of the case at the time, as I had a proper right to do, but preferred to adopt the example of ex-Chief Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court, and at the close of the trial administer such punishment, as I have the privilege to do under the statutes, for what I consider you both guilty of, contempt of court."

The Recorder then reviewed the various parts of the testimony of witnesses which he said had proved contemptuous and insolent conduct towards the Court on the part of Attorneys Goff and Jerome.

After reading the specifications which included but one offense of contempt against Mr